

## **Cultural Resources -- Draft Issues and Interests Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

Master list of issues raised at Public, Plenary, and Work Group meetings, and received via e-mail, letter, or fax (revision date contained in footer) related to cultural resources:

1. Protect Indian burial grounds around lake from recreation-induced disturbance
2. Fishing rights, traditional fishing activities, and water rights are gone – evaluate impact of project on those
3. Need to involve all Tribes, not just federally recognized ones
4. Develop Heritage Village
5. Protection of cultural sites along RR grade
6. Add island off Nelson Bar Road as a historical area.
7. Need more cultural education in this area (Oroville). Develop a fund for community education to resolve disputes between various groups and create better understanding.
8. When considering cultural endeavors, achieve equal opportunity for all people
9. Cultural resources that lie beneath the reservoir need to be considered for protection
10. Tribes want input on all issues and want to be actively involved in this process
11. Desire jobs and training for tribal members on this project
12. Complete area needs to be surveyed
13. Unfinished reports should be brought up to date
14. Butte County State collections need to be returned to the county and any further work done on the collection should be done within the county. Develop a curator facility for all tribes to use that could house all the collections and investigate possible loan from Smithsonian.
15. Minimize removal of artifacts – discuss disposition
16. Local schools and tribal members should have access to artifacts for educational purposes
17. Burial and other tribal lands set aside for protection of past and use for future (State and/or BLM lands)
18. Local members of the Native Tribal community that contribute to information should be compensated
19. Want artifacts that are found to stay in the community
20. Re-burial of exhumed bodies currently stored in West Sacramento; funding needed for transportation, land and assistance to cover costs of re-burial
21. Area 1 is rich with cultural resources and prime location for preservation.  
Concerned that increased recreational activities in the area is in conflict with protection of cultural resources
22. Support protection – want to see preservation of cultural resources and don't want to see them lose their identity (physical and knowledge identity)
23. Concerns for repatriation
24. Consider issues on a watershed level, involve all tribes
25. Concerned about Area 2 development – extension and potential impacts to cultural resources in area (burial sites)
26. Water drawdown (particularly bad this year) has exposed sites which are then subjected to vandalism. Concerned that County is not prosecuting offenders.
27. Desire to see development of a Maidu cultural center with access for all to the center.
28. There is an interest in inventorying heritage resource and traditional gathering sites located on national forest system lands located within and adjacent to the project and determining the risk posed to these sites from project operations, future development or vandalism. The inventory should also include a plan to conserve at risk sites.